

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 9, 11 and 12 have been amended. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dadiomov *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,932 B1), hereafter “Dadiomov,” in view of Yarom (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,710), hereafter “Yarom.”

Initially, Applicants again ask for clarification with regard to the Office’s rejection. Applicants have found it very difficult to interpret the Office’s arguments as written because they cite several passages of a reference to refer to several limitations of the claimed invention without specifying which passage applies to which limitation. For example, with regard to the Office’s arguments about the Yarom reference, the Office cites five separate passages of Yarom against claims a section of claims 1, 8, 11 and 12 of the claimed invention that has several

different limitations, including: a command, scope definitions, computer system resources, cooperating communication managers and shared access memory without specifying which features of Yarom that the Office believes teach or suggest the specific features of the claimed invention. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Office specify which specific passages of the references teach or suggest the different limitations of the claimed invention. However, for the purposes of this paper, Applicants will attempt to discern these specifics from the text of Yarom and respond accordingly.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office has rejected claims 1, 15 and 19 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 6 to recite "...[a] command interface for a computer program stored on a computer readable medium." Applicant asserts that this amendment further clarifies the invention. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Dadiomov in view of Yarom, Applicants assert that the combined features of the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claim 1, and similarly claimed in claims 6, 9, 11 and 12, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach that the computer system resources to which the command is to be applied are used by the at least one of the group of cooperating communication managers for processing data for

communicating among application programs. The Office admits that Dadiomov does not teach this feature. Instead, the Office appears to equate the computer system resources of the claimed invention with the database or the entries thereof of Yarom. Final Office Action, page 3, citing Yarom, col. 5, line 23-35 and line 66-67; col. 6, lines 12-36 and lines 54-59; and col. 7, lines 32-35. However, the neither the database nor the database entries of Yarom is used by another feature of Yarom for processing data for communicating among application programs. In contrast, the present invention includes "...wherein the computer system resources are used by the at least one of the group of cooperating communication managers for processing data for communicating among application programs." Claim 1. As such, the computer system resources to which the command of the claimed invention is applied is not merely a database or database data as in Yarom, but rather are used by the at least one of the group of cooperating communication managers for processing data for communicating among application programs. Thus, the computer system resources of the claimed invention are not taught or suggested by the resource to be accessed of Yarom. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claims 6, 9 and 11, and similarly claimed in claims 1 and 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a command having both command target qualifier and scope definition parameters. The Office equates the command having a command target qualifier of the claimed invention with the message of Dadiomov, which has a message ID identifying the destination. Col. 7, lines 55-64. The Office admits that Dadiomov does not teach the scope definition parameters of the claimed invention. Instead the Office equates the scope definition parameters of the command of the

claimed invention with elements of a database query of Yarom. Col. 5, line 23-35 and line 66-67; col. 6, lines 12-36 and lines 54-59; and col. 7, lines 32-35. However, Yarom never teaches or suggests adding anything resembling the message ID of Dadiomov to its query. Likewise, Dadiomov does not teach or suggest that its message contains anything resembling the query contents of Yarom. To this extent, neither the message of Dadiomov nor the query of Yarom has or suggests the features of the other. Furthermore, the message of Dadiomov is a network message, which is different from a query, such as the one in Yarom. As such, Applicants submit that the Office's combination of a database query having query elements of Yarom with the non-analogous network message having a destination ID of Dadiomov is not based on suggestion in the references themselves or in the art, but rather is based on hindsight provided from the claimed invention.

In contrast, the claimed invention includes providing a set of commands having the following parameters: a command target qualifier...and a scope definition." Claim 6. As such, the set of commands of the claimed invention does not merely have a destination ID for a single destination computer without scope definition parameters as does the message of Dadiomov and/or query elements as does the database query of Yarom, but instead has both a command target qualifier and scope definition parameters. For the above reason, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the set of commands of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Office's rejection be withdrawn.

With still further respect to independent claim 1, and with respect to claims 8 and 10, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a set of target qualifiers of a command, wherein at least one the set of command target qualifiers includes

at least one command target qualifier indicating that a single command should be targeted to all members of the group of cooperating communication managers. As stated above, the Office equates the command of the claimed invention with the message of Dadiomov. Col. 7, lines 55-64; col. 10, lines 36-44. This message of Dadiomov has "...a destination ID which uniquely identifies the destination queue." Col. 7, lines 59-62. To this extent, the destination ID of Dadiomov identifies a single destination queue. This destination queue may be a regular destination queue or a foreign queue, but, in either case, the destination ID identifies a single queue. Col. 10, lines 36-44. Nowhere does Dadiomov teach that its destination ID may include an indication that the message is to be sent to all queues.

The claimed invention, in contrast, includes "...a set of target qualifiers of a command, ...wherein at least one the set of command target qualifiers includes at least one command target qualifier indicating that a single command should be targeted to *all members* of the group of cooperating communication managers." Claim 1. As such, in contrast to the destination ID that uniquely identifies a single destination queue of Dadiomov, the at least one command target qualifier of the claimed invention that indicates whether a single command should be targeted to *all members* of the group of cooperating communication managers in part of the command itself. Thus, the message of Dadiomov does not teach the command of the claimed invention. Yarom does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims 14-17, Applicants assert that the Office fails point out with specificity where the cited references teach or suggest that the cooperating communication managers are queue managers. Furthermore, with respect to dependent claims 15-17, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office fails point out with specificity where the cited references teach

or suggest that the computer program is a queue. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims in condition for allowance.


With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserve the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Date: April 19, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew